DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 152 114 FL 009 366

AUTHOR Kulakow, Allan
TITLE Foreign Language Training in the United States Peace Corps.
INSTITUTION Peace Corps, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Apr 67
NOTE 76p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; Instructional Materials; *Language Instruction; Language Proficiency; *Language Programs; Language Skills; *Language Tests; Post Secondary Education; *Program Descriptions; *Program Development; *Program Evaluation; Second Language Learning; Teaching Methods; Testing; Uncommonly Taught Languages; Volunteers; Volunteer Training
IDENTIFIERS *Peace Corps

ABSTRACT

This document reports on the foreign language training offered in the Peace Corps. Following a brief introductory statement, a list of languages taught by the Peace Corps in the years 1961-67 is provided, as well as a brief description of Peace Corps language training methods. Guidelines for language coordinators are outlined, and the approach to language proficiency testing is described. The document concludes with an outline of the procedures for implementation and reporting of language testing, and critical questions for the planning and evaluation of language training programs are raised. (CLK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED152114

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TRAINING

IN THE

UNITED STATES PEACE CORPS

Prepared by: Allan Kulakow
Director
Division of
Language Training
Office of Training
Washington, D.C.
April, 1967

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Peace Corps

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED009366

CONTENTS

I. Introduction: "To Speak as Equals" - A Report to the Director

II. Languages Taught by Peace Corps 1961- 1967

III. A Brief Description of Peace Corps Language Training
Prepared by: Allan Kulakow
Director, Division of Language Training
Peace Corps

IV. Guidelines for Language Coordinators

V. Language Proficiency Testing
Prepared by: Claudia Wilds
Head, Testing Unit
Foreign Service Institute

VI. Implementation and Reporting of Language Testing

VII. Critical Questions for Planning and Evaluating Language Training Programs

I. INTRODUCTION

"To Speak as Equals"
A Report to the Director

"To Speak as Equals"
A Report to the Director

The Peace Corps has become in its few years of existence the nation's biggest consumer of language learning products.

New texts for languages never taught before in this country and for others which have never been taught anywhere are being developed for Peace Corps training needs. New foreign language teachers are being trained in modern and more effective methods. Universities and Colleges which train Peace Corps Volunteers are being asked to give intensive language courses, a new experience for many of these institutions.

Each year close to 10,000 Peace Corps Trainees study one or more of the approximately 120 languages of the Peace Corps world. Now more dramatically than ever before PCVs are demonstrating that the so-called tongue-tied American is a phenomenon of the past, that PCVs can work and live in languages most of them had never heard of until they came into the Peace Corps. And the nation is enjoying a replenishing of its national linguistic resources left depleted from the time of World War I immigration days when parents and children strove to forget their native languages to become "Good Americans". Now, as "Good Americans," PCVs coming back from service overseas are restoring and enriching these resources. A few years ago few people in the United States spoke or even heard of such languages as Nepali, Tumbuku, Wolof. Today the education, government, and business worlds can call on dozens if not hundreds of returned Peace Corps Volunteers who speak these languages fluently and intelligently.

A new era of better understanding, of new and truly real communication between peoples has been initiated by the Peace Corps Volunteers. "We come to speak as equals," said one PCV, in the language of his community, not in the language of the white European colonial. A new time of trust and mutual appreciation is beginning and the PCV is there working and speaking "as an equal".

II. LANGUAGES TAUGHT BY PEACE CORPS 1961-1967

LANGUAGES TAUGHT BY PEACE CORPS 1961-1967

(Listed alphabetically by country)

Afghanistan	Afghan Farsi Pashto
Bolivia	Aymara Quechua Spanish
Botswana	Tswana
Brazil	Portuguese
British Honduras	Spanish
Cameroon	Bassa Bula Douala Fang French Pidgin (Weskos)
Chad	Arabic Kanembu Sara
Chile	Spanish
Ceylon	Singhalese Tamil
Colombia	Spanish
Costa Rica	Spanish
Cyprus [1]	Greek
Dahomey [2]	Fon French
Dominican Republic	Spanish
Ecuador	Quechua Spanish
El Salvador	Spanish
Ethiopia	Amharic Tigrinya*

Fiji[3]	Fijian
Gabon	Fang French Yipounou
Gambia[2]	Fula Mandingue (Bambara)
Ghana	Ewe Twi
Guatemala	Spanish
Guinea[1]	French Fula Susu
Guyana	Spanish
Honduras	Spanish
India	Bengali Bihari Hindi Kannada Malayalam Marathi Oriya Punjabi Tamil Telegu Urdu
Indonesia[1]	Indonesian
Iran	Farsi
Ivory Coast	Baoule Dioula French Senotti
Jamaica	Creole

Kenya	Kikuyu
	Swahili
Lesotho [2]	Sesotho
Liberia	Kissi*
	Kpelle
	Kru*
	Lome*
	Mano*
	Pidgin
	Vai*
Libya	Arabic
Malawi	Chinyanja
	Tumbuka
Malaysia	Bahasa Malay (Mainland)
	Pizar Malay (Sabah/Sarawak)
Mauritania	Arabic
	French
Micronesia	Chamorro
	Kusaie
	Marshallese
	Ponapean
	Trukese
	Trukese (lagoon dialect)
	Ulithi
	Yapese
Morocco	Arabic
	Berber*
	French
	Spanish*
Nepal	Bhojpuri*
	Hindi*
	Maithili*
	Nepali
	Tharu*

Niger	Djerma
	French
	Hausa
	Kanouri
	Tamachek*
Nigeria	Bini
	Efik
	Hausa
	Igbo
	Pidgin
	Yoruba
Pakistan	Bengali
	Pashto
	Punjabi
	Sindhi
	Urdu
Panama	Spanish
Paraguay	Guarani
	Spanish
Peru	Quechua
	Spanish
Philippines	Aklanon*
	Bicolano* I and II
	Cebuano
	Hiligaynon
	Ilocano
	Magindanao*
	Maranao*
	Pampagano*
	Pangasinan*
	Tagalog
	Waray-Waray*
	Zamboangueno* (Chabacano)
Senegal	Fula
	French
	Wolof

Sierra Leone	Fula Kissi Krio Kuranko Limba Mende Sherbro Susu Temne Yalunka
Somali Republic	Italian Somali
South Korea	Korean
Tanzania	Swahili
Thailand	Thai
Togo	Cabrais Ewe French Kotokoli Mina
Tonga[3]	Tongan
Tunisia	Arabic French
Turkey	Turkish
Uganda	Luganda Swahili
Upper Volta[2]	Bambara Bobo French Gourmantche More
Uruguay	Spanish
Venezuela	Spanish

West Samoa	Samoa
Windward/Leeward Islands	Creole (English) Creole (French)

1 - no longer a Peace Corps country
2 - first Peace Corps projects sheduled for 1967
* - taught in the field only
3 - expected to become a Peace Corps country

III. A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF PEACE CORPS LANGUAGE TRAINING

BY: Allan Kulakow
Division of Language Training
Office of Training
United States Peace Corps

PEACE CORPS LANGUAGE TRAINING

CONTENTS

I. Introduction

II. Methodology

III. Pedagogy

IV. Instruction

V. Teacher Training

VI. Immersion Environment

VII. The Language Laboratory

VIII. Integration of Language Study with Other Training Components

IX. Multilingual Programs

X. Testing

XI. Language Proficiency and Selection

XII. In-Service Study

XIII. Challenges, Responsibilities and Future Goals

I. Introduction

Peace Corps training programs now devote more than half the instructional time to intensive language instruction. During the 13-week training program, between 300 and 400 hours are spent on language training. Small classes of no more than six students meet from four to six hours a day with additional time in the language laboratory, language tables at meal time, and supported by what is called "Immersion Environment" training, wherein the training program tries to bring both the language and culture of the host country into the daily living and learning hours of the trainees.

At the beginning, middle and end of training the trainees are tested for their oral proficiency in the target languages. Based on what the Volunteer achieved during his training, plans are formulated for continued training or self-study overseas. Often it is imperative that the Volunteer learn a second foreign language after he arrives in the country in which he will serve for two years.

At the end of three to six months after arrival overseas, the Volunteer is given another oral language test to measure his accomplishments and problems as well as to stimulate him to further study. And finally at the end of his two year tour of duty, the

Volunteer is again given an oral proficiency test to determine his final achievement in his language studies.

The Peace Corps does not consider the end of the pre-service training program as the completion of preparation. Throughout the two years of overseas service, the Peace Corps encourages and stimulates constant in-service training. The growing effectiveness of the Volunteer overseas depends on this support.

II. Methodology

Peace Corps training has adopted a modern oral intensive, audio-lingual method of language teaching. Sometimes called the oral-aural method, "guided repetition," "automaticity," etc., the emphasis is nevertheless on learning to speak the language, rather than learning literary skills.

The approach to "what is language" is through structural linguistics, that is an understanding of the structural elements of the language as it is spoken rather than an idealized literary description of what the language should be. The latter is what we usually call grammar. Grammatical descriptions of language often confuse the written and the spoken languages whereas a structural approach deals only with the spoken language. The written system is considered separately. Nevertheless, we have found that first teaching the spoken language facilitates the learning of reading and writing.

An example of this structural/grammatical difference is the description of the imperfect verb form in French. In the written language there are nine forms to learn:

je marchais	nous marchions
tu marchais	vous marchiez
il marchait	ils marchaient
elle marchait	elles marchaient
on marchait	

Whereas structurally, there are only three forms to learn:

/e/ "ay" as in "marchais," "marchait," "marchaient"
/io/ "eeon" as in "marchions"
/ie/ "eeay" as in "marchiez"

This approach in no way deprecates the literacy skills. It merely separates the tasks, facilitates the learning of reading and writing, and serves the Peace Corps Volunteer's need to have an oral command of the language.

When one doubts the validity of this approach, one should be reminded that over half the languages in the world are not written.

III. Pedogogy

Present day oral language teaching is based on modern learning theories which consider oral language learning as an acquisition of new automatic skills or habits. The development of these new habits necessitates considerable repetitious practice to develop automatic control of new muscular movements to produce "strange" new sounds, and new structural forms. Further practice of these new forms in required to reinforce the learning and to strengthen

the retention of these newly learned linguistic habits. We work for "overlearning", that is, more practice than that which is required to simply acquire the new oral skills. This over-practice will extinguish old oral habits that interfere and reinforce the retention of the new forms in face of interference from the native language of the learner. We strive for automatic control of the new language forms. As new forms are learned the previously learned forms are expanded, recombined and further manipulated so to provide a growing foundation on which the new language can be built. Vocabulary is not stressed; life experiences take care of that. Rather, the emphasis is on these basic, building-block structural forms.

Usually the modern oral language text consists of many small lessons. Most often the lesson starts with a small dialogue written in the cultural context of the target language. Here are introduced in normal conversation the structural items to be drilled and learned in that lesson, as well as recapitulating previously learned material. These basic sentences are learned perfectly. It is essential that the student master the sounds of the target language so as to facilitate basic learning and eliminate interference from his own language. After the dialogue has been mastered, the student is drilled on the new forms, each item carefully and at great length, until it is learned perfectly. It is

important to remember that the student is taught only what he can learn and works on a particular structural point until mastered. An overloaded learning situation will result in little learning, little retention. Often the drill process consists of learning drills, and often more real-life conversations or dialogue drills. At all times, however, the drills are in the form of normal spoken phrases, never lists of words.

Drills frequently occur as substitution exercises where one element is changed in the drill or often as manipulative drills where, for practice, the student makes changes in tense, person, etc. At no time is new material introduced in the drills. This occurs only in the dialogue. An example of a simple structural drill would be as follows:

Teacher	Je vais a la gare (Model)
Student	Je vais à la gare (Answer)
Teacher	_____ à la poste (Cue)
Answer	Je vais à la poste (Answer and Model)
Teacher	Il va _____ (Cue)
Student	Il va à la post (Answer and Model)
Teacher	_____ a Paris (Cue)
	etc.

An excellent description and discussion of the drill phase of language instruction can be found in the Instructor's Manual for Modern French, by Dan Desberg and Lucette Rollet Kenan, published by Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., New York, 1964.

As the student accumulates more and more knowledge, that is,

more and more automatic control of the structural elements of the new language, his ability to exploit this information as conversation becomes increasingly strengthened. After having thoroughly practiced and mastered the dialogue and structural drill material, the student is then prepared to "make conversation." He is stimulated to produce meaningful conversation in meaningful, realistic contexts but with constant attention given to noting incorrect forms, absence of correct linguistic information, and to weak and inaccurate control of supposedly previously learned structural points. Further practice is then prescribed to overcome these weaknesses.

Adults learn a second language in a way very similar to learning such complicated skills as skiing or driving an automobile. The speed at which these activities occur demands automatic responses. These can come only after considerable practice of each necessary muscular and mental reaction. Coordination of these reactions results in accurate and successful skiing or driving. Learning of bad habits can result in serious accidents while performing at high speeds. In a similar way, second language skills face the same problems, and must be mastered in very similar ways.

IV. Instruction

To maximize the effectiveness of the audio-lingual method, language classes are kept small, six students at the most. Teachers

are preferably native speakers of the language. The entire program is supervised by the language specialist, that is someone experienced in language teaching with some background in linguistics. Intensive classes are held from four to six hours a day with perhaps some additional time in the language laboratory. At all times the teacher speaks at a normal rate, avoiding artificial or literary forms not used in normal conversation. The language specialist or linguist supervises the training of the teacher. He does any formal classroom grammatical explanation necessary. He serves as a bridge between the two languages. He understands what sounds and grammatical structures in the target language are difficult for the student and why those difficulties exist. He understands precisely how one language interferes with learning the new one and guides the instructor in drilling the student to overcome these problems. Because adequate linguistic supervision is essential to successful language training, it is recommended that if there are more than 5 classes, that there be an assistant language supervisor, and finally, that the language supervisor himself be responsible for no more than ten classes.

V. Teacher Training

Adequate training of the teacher in the methods of oral intensive language instruction is essential to the success of the program.

Without proper preparation, the teacher may resort to his own "methods" or to grammar descriptions to answer problems encountered by the students in drilling toward automatic oral control of the language. A useful device in training instructors is to give them intensive instruction for a few days in a language with which they are not familiar. The language supervisor uses the opportunity to demonstrate not only methodology but also the problems of being a language student. Teacher training of one to two weeks usually precedes all Peace Corps training programs. Nevertheless, the language director must maintain constant supervision of teachers as well as students, assisting new teachers to improve instruction and to provide a stimulating classroom that will make the most of the high motivation of Peace Corps trainees.

VI. Immersion Environment

One of the best stimuli to successful language training is the Immersion Environment. Here, every effort is made to make the target language the only important and meaningful language for communication. Sometimes, trainees are asked to sign pledges not to speak English during training or simply are required to speak only the target language at meals. But more effective is the creation of an environment which simulates the cultural environment of the host country. Such an immersion situation is the Nepali House set

up at one Peace Corps training site. Here, the program went to such extremes as bringing in cow dung each week and replastering the floor with it. Every effort was made to duplicate a Nepalese house. Frequently, for our Spanish and French speaking programs, language houses are set up in which the trainees are constantly exposed to the target language through people, social activities, movies, newspapers and books. To support all this, it is essential that the instructors avoid speaking English whenever possible.

We have the additional advantage of being able to send trainees to Puerto Rico and occasionally to French-speaking Canada for a few more weeks of language immersion. In some cases, part of the training program is held in the country where the Volunteers will work. Here the trainees profit not only from the environmental immersion but also by using the language in its realistic cultural setting.

VII. The Language Laboratory

The language laboratory, consisting of several tape recorders and copies of the recorded text and supplemental material, can be a useful complement to an intensive language program. However, it is normally more valuable to spend the six hours of language training per day in the classroom with a native speaker than in the laboratory. Sometimes, however, effective programming of the laboratory can be very useful in accelerating classroom work by

providing extra practice time or by carefully planned drill and practice of new material. Such an example of programmed instruction is: Spanish "A," a programmed course in Spanish, Stanley Sapon, Encyclopedia Britannica Films, Inc., Wilmette, Illinois. But the laboratory is not human, cannot correct and give personalized attention to a learner's problems. The machine is helpful when adequate training resources are not available. However, the heavy training schedule usually doesn't permit much time in the laboratory if six hours is spent in the language class.

Nevertheless, tapes and machines should be available for use after class hours and at free moments. This permits individual trainees to attend to some of their individual language problems as well as affording additional practice time.

VIII. Integration of Language Study with Other Training Components

Every effort is made to integrate the language training program with the other aspects of Peace Corps training, that is, area studies, technical training, health, physical education, community development, etc. Language instructors participate in area studies, meeting with the trainees and lecturing in the target language. Language lessons are written to deal with technical subjects pertinent to the Volunteers' service. Often physical exercise sessions are conducted in the target language. Also, the language staff

always accompanies the trainees on field trips ensuring continuity in language instruction as well as providing many effective informal social moments for realistic reinforcement of language learning. The Peace Corps is constantly experimenting to provide even closer and more productive integration of language training with other training components.

IX. Multilingual Programs

Multilingual training programs have been rather successfully developed for countries where two languages are necessary for effective Peace Corps service. For example, French and Hausa are taught for Niger; French and Wolof for Senegal.

Minimum levels of proficiency are set for the first language. When this level is achieved, the second language is started. In a few cases some training in both languages occurs concomitantly.

This is not to suggest that both languages can be learned to a high degree of fluency. However, when it is necessary to have some proficiency in a second language, a realistic statement of what is the minimal level required for the first will guide the programming of the second. This has worked well in many cases, particularly with those trainees who came with some background in the first language.

X. Testing

Peace Corps training programs have adopted an oral proficiency rating scale for language achievement based on a realistic evaluation of what the trainee can do with the language. The system is based on an S (for speaking) Scale that goes from S-0 to S-5 with plus (+) grades to allow for finer judgments. An S-2 is considered a minimal working proficiency and is now the desired level of proficiency for all trainees at the end of training. An S-3 is labeled "professional proficiency." A Peace Corps agricultural aide might function well with only an S-2 rating but a secondary level teacher might have considerable difficulty teaching content subjects with less than an S-3. It is therefore often necessary to achieve a yet higher level of proficiendy after the Volunteer has been in the country a period of months.

This system helps to remove the subjective assessment of personality with assessment of oral language proficiency. Here we are interested in what the trainee can say and how well he can say it in the new language. Furthermore, it serves as a stimulus to language directors to improve their program: Achieving S-2s this program will stimulate S-3s as next program's goal.

This rating system, developed by the Foreign Service Institute, Department of State, is used by Peace Corps for training programs,

staff training, project programming and for testing overseas. Other government agencies and a few academic institutions also normally use this testing scale to measure oral language proficiency. It provides a useful and easily communicated measurement tool in discussing achievement on the part of the trainee, helps the overseas staff plan in-country training, and gives the overseas staff an idea of the linguistic resources of the Volunteers in service. At present, trainees are tested at the outset of training if they claim any proficiency in the target language. A mid-point rating is often estimated. Final testing comes before final selection and further testing will occur after any field work before the Volunteer leaves for his overseas assignment.

Tests are administered by the language specialist and a native speaker of the language. It consists of a brief interview examination with care given to involve the trainee in situations wherein the ability to use the language at various levels can be measured.

Volunteers are also tested orally overseas 3 to 6 months after arrival overseas and again upon completion of their Peace Corps duty.

XI. Language Proficiency and Selection

At present Peace Corps does not select a trainee out of a program solely on his low achievement in language training. Rather, we use his proficiency rating as a guide for job placement and area assign-

ment. For example, a Volunteer assigned as a teacher but who has a low S rating cannot effectively teach in the language. He may require further or more intensive language training at the training institution or overseas before he can be assigned as a teacher. In some cases where language proficiency is so low for a job which required strong language skill, the Volunteer may be assigned to another project in another country.

Performance in intensive language training offers much useful information about the total ability of a trainee to serve overseas as a Volunteer. Continued and further research will some day clarify these questions of language learning achievement and Peace Corps service.

XII. In-Service Study

At present Peace Corps encourages and often insists that Peace Corps Volunteers continue language study in the field. Self-study or continuing study in the field at present consists of tutorial lessons, often given by unskilled and unguided local "teachers," text materials shipped overseas at the request of staff or Volunteer, and in-country classes under some professional linguistic direction.

But effective self-study materials are scarce and adequate instruction overseas difficult to find.

In general, much attention needs to be given to the development

of self-study materials and the training of instructors. There is at present little professional support for continuing language study overseas. It is hoped that with the increasing participation of language specialists in overseas testing more professional assistance can be given to in-service language study. Also, continued research and experimentation is being done to develop useful self-study materials. Lastly, time is now being given in Peace Corps training programs to instruction as to how to go about studying and learning a language in the field.

XIII. Challenges, Responsibilities, and Future Goals

For the most part Peace Corps Volunteers are receiving adequate language preparation before leaving for overseas. But sensing the seriousness of the role language plays in the effectiveness of a successful Volunteer, the Peace Corps now asks for even better training and higher oral language proficiency. The energies of those involved in training are working to provide the means to achieve this. Furthermore, the Peace Corps has become seriously aware of the importance of teaching the many indigenous languages of the countries where Peace Corps Volunteers serve, particularly in Africa. It can no longer only be concerned with those European languages widely used in these countries. New materials must be developed and new methods and specialists found. Though Peace Corps

now teaches several languages never taught anywhere before, this program must be expanded to meet the many new linguistic needs of the Peace Corps Volunteers.

Better instruction and successful training in the ever growing number of languages of the Peace Corps world are the present and future goals of the Peace Corps language training program.

IV. GUIDELINES FOR LANGUAGE COORDINATORS

GUIDELINES FOR LANGUAGE COORDINATORS

The following "Guidelines for Language Coordinators" reflects the thoughts and experience of many persons who have worked with Peace Corps language training.

Building on a sample guideline submitted to Special Projects by Dr. Guido Capponi of the University of Arizona, Dr. Marie Gadsden prepared, and, with the assistance of other interested persons in OT, expanded the "Guidelines for Language Coordinators" to its present form.

I. In addition to professional competency in modern, linquistically-based methodology, the Language Coordinator requires maturity, cooperation, breadth of human understanding, administrative tact and competency, and patience. The Coordinator must develop team rapport and provide leadership and discipline.

   Within the administrative organization under the direction of the Project Director the Language Coordinator has the following responsibilities:

   A. To approve all language staff members and informants. If possible, the Language Coordinator should have the opportunity to interview and select his own staff, or at least to stipulate his requirements for staff selection.

   B. To recommend dismissal of staff members and informants.

   C. To organize and administer a one-to-two-week orientation and pre-program training of staff and informants.

   D. To develop a program suitable to whatever environment(s) the program is held in, whether campus, camp, field site or in-country location.

   E. To daily supervise by means of class visits, to observe, to counsel and to evaluate language staff and Peace Corps classes.

   F. To undertake pre-program development of format for consistent methodology.

G. To establish Peace Corps evaluation and testing procedures consistent with Peace Corps language objectives. Focus should be aural/oral but, to the extent relevant, writing and reading skills should be tested also.

H. To maintain accurate, frequent, meaningful records -- i.e., S-ratings, frequent aural/oral testing, related written exercises; ability grouping criteria to be consistently applied on the basis of progress during training; observation reports on out-of-class language performance, interrelationship evaluation, evidence of initiative and creativity in language component, attendance, attitude and appearance records distinct from language competency.

I. To develop language and linguistic materials that relate to PCV eventual assignment.

J. To adapt field materials (basic tests, syllabi, compositions, etc.) to modern language principles, as flexibly as possible. To develop a presentation of compromise between modern U.S. and traditional field material objectively and positively for teaching programs particularly.

K. To evaluate texts based on specific criteria of job requirements, and annotate language library items to be used as supplementary training materials.

L. To create materials and techniques for language training to fit the specific requirement of the program.

M. To integrate language study with Cross-Cultural Studies, Technical Studies, Health Education and Physical Education. To frequently attend lecture/discussions of other components.

N. To experiment and exchange ideas with other Peace Corps Language Coordinators and programs and participate in Language Coordinators' meetings when possible.

O. To understand and utilize FSI S-rating examination techniques.

II. Basic Questions to be answered by PC/W. The Language Coordinator must know the answers in order to plan adequately.

A. Where is the PCV going? -- country, region, size of community, job structure and situation, etc.

B. What will the PCV be doing? -- teacher, community development worker, public health worker, etc.

C. What is the total impact of the specific Peace Corps program to be? Expansion of an existing program, replacement of present program, change of former program to new program, adjunct to another agency program, cooperative venture with some other organization? -- goals of Peace Corps in the host country; goals of host country in the specific field of assignment.

D. What former Peace Corps programs have been trained for the country? If any, what was the nature of the language evaluation? If at another institution, what were the strengths and weaknesses of the program(s).

E. What are the trainees' MLAT scores? If the language to be studied is commonly taught, what are the trainees' current levels of ability?

F. What S-rating is expected? What are the implications of language to job?

G. What Peace Corps language materials are available and relevant? Is revision of existing materials necessary? Is new material needed?

H. What former language personnel can be useful for consultation?

III. Further considerations, based on the answers to questions in II above, to be faced by Language Coordinator.

A. Close and constant exchange during planning stage with OT officer, PC/W, so that agreement on program objectives, design and content is assured.

B. Acquisition of specific texts and appropriate dictionaries related to host country to which PCV will be assigned.

If PCVs are training for Panama, materials on Spain or Brazil may be irrelevant; if for Tanzania, materials or texts on Senegal, Tunisia or Liberia may not be germane.

C. Coordination with Cross-Cultural Studies Coordinator so that language content and cross-cultural content may subserve.

D. Contact U.S.I.A., AID and Department of State for any country resources that might be useful in the language program; Center for Applied Linguistics for resource personnel and text information.

E. Write or visit host country embassy or host country UN delegation for "realia" (records, posters, pamphlets, etc.) to be used for creating atmosphere and immersion situation. Invite speakers or host country language participants, specialists visiting in U. S., etc. Channel both human and material resources to motivate and sustain PCT language learning and enthusiasm.

F. Obtain through OT from Peace Corps/field staff, Contractor's Overseas Representation, in-country professional support staff, or from host country agencies "realia"; write airlines and travel agencies serving host country for materials.

G. Assemble, organize and use out of class throughout the language component material for a reading phase that relates to PCV assignments.

H. Determine from 104, (training program description) and consultation with Training Officer, the degree, if any, to which writing ability will be involved in the Volunteers' jobs.

I. Prepare specific nomenclature and incorporate into exercises any technical vocabulary lists or materials relating to Technical Studies and incorporate into meaningful drills with test follow-through. Get Language staff out to Technical Skills classes and Technical Skills staff into Language classes.

J. Clarify specific cultural problems of target country.

IV. Methodology:

What we call it is not important; what it does is. Preparing PCTs to understand that in order to teach another language to speakers whose aural, oral, reading and writing habits operate on the subconscious patterned level of behavior or automatic, conditioned response, the basic job is to build automatic new language behavior (aural, oral, reading, writing) in the target language. Repetition, drill practice--whatever you wish to call the technique essential to establish habits at the level of automaticity--is the inevitable means.

Introduction of the writing system, if necessary to the successful performance of the job, should be done imaginatively and with attention to providing techniques for the continuing acquisition of writing skill while the Volunteer is abroad.

A. If he must use the new language as a tool on his job assignment, the PCV must achieve a linguistic level which provides the tools for him to continue his language study to achieve the following:

1. Understanding of what he hears regardless of native intonation, pace, situation (movies, radio, lecture, conversation, etc.) and standard regional variants in the target language.

2. Speaking what he needs to communicate:

a) clear and accurate explanation and demonstration of tasks.

b) recognition and understanding of cultural differences in terms of specific language "do's" and "don't's".

c) address any group; communicate without committing too many linguistic "goofs".

3. Reading intelligently and facilely the current periodicals and newspapers, the technical materials relevant to PCV area of specialty.

4. Writing simply but accurately: letters, thank-you notes, job descriptions, requests, schedules, etc.

B. The method will utilize and emphasize these learning disciplines:

1. Memorization and over-learning.

2. Much mimicry through oral exercises, presented in a meaningful sequence and reinforced and manipulated in a consistent and continual variety of patterns.

3. Maximum opportunity for oral exchange between instructors/informants and pupils.

4. Realistic dialogues that easily lend themselves to structural manipulations and to use outside the classroom proper.

a) short dialogues

b) much drilling

c) much readaptation

d) much and varied testing, used purposefully and judiciously.

1) to motivate and stimulate constructive competition.

2) to discipline pupils to improve study habits.

3) to evaluate teacher and pupil.

4) to teach and reteach areas of persistent difficulty.

5) to promote self-evaluation and self-awareness.

6) to build confidence and to habituate pupils to formal measurement techniques.

C. The method must demand:

1. That the PCV progress at his utmost speed.

2. The resectioning as often as deemed necessary by the Language Coordinator on the basis of ability and performance.

3. The realistic application and integration of language and other components (PCVs may have to teach carpentry, physical education, machine maintenance, English, adult literacy materials, etc.).

4. That the PCV compete with himself and with his ability group.

D. The method must be absolutely accepted and mastered by all teachers. The language staff must perform as an enthusiastic and confident team--not as separate and independent participants at variance with the Coordinator or language colleagues.

1. Evaluation procedure must be valid, consistent, uniform.

2. Teachers must identify each PCV's potential early in the program.

3. Teachers must be able to adapt easily and quickly to lesson plan adjustments and to inadvertent shifts in schedule -- room, time, newly available field data, unexpectedly available language resource visitors from host country or returned Volunteers or field staff.

VI. Materials and texts:

The question of texts and materials is important; the question of how the texts and materials are used is far more important.

A. No 3 months language program should attempt to cover a text.

Teach the essentials. This means selecting and discriminating textual items and reducing the material to the bare essentials. Most texts will require modification, emendation, supplementation, or adaptation.

B. Synthesize text to include pertinent data and realistic nomenclature (if a text uses place names such as Madrid, Paris or Washington, D. C., substitute place names of the host country).

C. Utilize a tight, effective daily lesson plan, accounting for every minute and exploiting materials in a variety of ways.

D. Encourage coordinators of other components of the Peace Corps program to channel language items to be used in the scheduled lessons.

E. Language Coordinator and/or some language staff members should be capable of developing, writing or editing language materials.

F. If returned PCV and/or host country language informants are on Peace Corps staff, use them as resource people for current materials and for adaptation of text to practical demands which PCV will face.

VII. Scheduling:

A. Be realistic about language hours in relationship to the program demands, the other components, the physical resources of the trainees and the variables which affect scheduling (medical appointments, selection, etc.).

B. Insist on <u>some</u> prime time: first hours of the morning.

C. Organize program for minimum of four hours of language study a day.

D. Arrange for PCTs to have materials and portable equipment available on loan for use in the residence area or individual and small group sessions of unscheduled study.

E. Check for maximum convenience and appropriateness of location, facility and space for language classes.

VIII. Class size

Remember that intensive work is more effective in small classes. The Peace Corps supports a maximum ratio of one staff member to every six trainees. Observe strictly this ratio in organizing your language team. If possible, it is desirable to have even smaller classes.

IX. Checklist:

A. Minimize use of electronic language laboratory. Portable aids such as the Solocast or the tape recorder are sufficient for remedial oral exercises in pronunciation, intonation and stress.

B. Encourage and insist upon PCV assumptions of roles in situations so he will need to relate, explain, defend, summarize, or interpret in the target language.

C. Aim at having some area or cross-cultural discussion/lectures given in the target language at the end of the seventh or eighth week.

D. Ascertain each week ways in which language and other components can dovetail and plan the language lesson to insure that language subserves the other components.

E. Insert a stress factor demanding PCV to perform in a 1-1 relationship (teacher and PCV) with a third person acting as evaluator.

F. Teacher - PCV ratio of not more than 1:6, and less if possible.

G. FSI testing demands a careful administering in a well defined progression of question-answer sequences that accurately establish the actual S-level. Teachers must be trained in the testing involved.

H. If 104 stipulates, reading and writing skills are immediately relevant to the Volunteer's job:

1. Reading - begin in the 4th week.

2. Begin writing in the 6th week. Start with simple, meaningful phrases that are a response to a given problem.

I. Provide language informants for field work and test field work in the languages after mid-board.

J. Teacher evaluates every day. Inform PCV as to his progress and class rank.

K. Avoid "personal" emotional involvement. This is a training program, not a chaplain's office nor a popularity contest.

Enforce strict silence on selection policy, results of selection and effectiveness of selection. Any staff member, other than selection personnel, should be subject to dismissal, if there is any proof that the emotional climate at selection time has been heightened by any indiscretion on the part of the language staff.

Remember that language is not the sole factor in selection into the Peace Corps. Help the PCTs to appreciate this fact, if negative reactions or comments on selection develop in the language situation.

The MLAT is far from perfect. Do not prejudge.

L. Tempo of language program continuously increases until through careful testing well-defined ability groups stabilize.

X. Cultural Immersion: at best, a campus offers a simulated ambient. However, insistence on a few mature and basic ground rules is necessary:

1. The target language is the language to be used in and out of class.

2. Monitoring (friendly) is the responsibility of both teachers, and high achievers among the group who have some beginning competence in the language.

3. Classrooms, dorms, etc., should display "realia" in language appropriate to the country.

4. Occasional fiestas or festivals are to be encouraged.

5. A library, reading, study room with interesting periodicals, references, slides and tape recorders is a desirable asset.

6. Wherever possible, a well-structured field trip to a country, area, neighborhood speaking the language is an invaluable experience.

XI. CONCLUSION

Any Coordinator who believes in the "remote control theory" of administering a language program will experience a few memorable shocks and surprises. The morale factor alone can determine the degree of excellence or shambles of any Peace Corps Language Program. You cannot expect maximum, dedicated performance from a staff which rarely sees you, hears from you, speaks with you. Nor can the Coordinator expect any semblance of respect, if he does not clearly set forth objectives and policy by evidencing his own interest and ability.

V. LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY TESTING

Prepared by: Claudia Wilds
Head, Testing Unit
Foreign Service
Institute
Department of State

LANGUAGE TESTING IN THE PEACE CORPS

Language testing for the Peace Corps began in June of 1963 when the first Volunteers were ending their service abroad. Examiners from the Foreign Service Institute, the training branch of the Department of State, gave Spanish proficiency tests to some 90 Volunteers in the Chile I and Colombia I groups during their terminal conferences.

Since that time over 2,000 tests have been given overseas, primarily to terminating Volunteers in Latin America and South Asia, and all trainees are rated in speaking proficiency both before and after training. In July, 1965 the testing policy was extended to provide for mid-tour testing in the field wherever possible.

The Testing Procedure

The tests used in the Peace Corps are those developed by the State Department to rate the speaking and reading proficiency of Foreign Service personnel and subsequently applied to personnel of the U.S. Information Agency, the Agency for International Development, and foreign affairs employees of many other Government organizations. They are designed to provide a quick, dependable measure of ability that can be used to determine linguistic qualifications for specific job assignments or need for further training.

A test normally lasts 30-40 minutes; the time is evenly divided between speaking and reading (if there is a writing system and the examinee claims reading proficiency). The examiners are usually a scientific linguist and a native speaker of the language involved.

The speaking part is primarily conducted by the native speaker, with the linguist observing and taking notes on the performance. An experienced testing team will have in mind throughout both the functional skills and the linguistic skills to be measured: the functional skills in the form of topics to be covered, varying from person to person, and the linguistic skills principally in the form of a check-list, mental or written, of phonetic and grammatical features of the language.

The test normally begins with routine greetings, introductions, and other remarks to make the examinee feel at home and give the examiners a sense of whether he is at the top, middle, or bottom of the range.

The next step is usually to ask autobiographical questions about home, family, past and current work, and future plans. If the answers to these questions come painfully or not at all, the rest of the test is conducted at an elementary level. If the answers come with reasonable ease and linguistic accuracy, the questioning usually probes the examinee's field of special interest in more technical details, explores local current events of all kinds, and may go into quite complex and abstract issues pertinent to the examinee's experience.

In addition to this informal conversation the speaking test may include at least two other features.

The first is a problem given by the linguist (usually in English) in which the examinee and the native speaker play roles. For example, "You have just been stopped by this policeman for having driven unintentionally the wrong way down a one-way street."

The second requires the examinee to serve as an interpreter between the linguist and the native speaker; for example, the linguist may play an American who needs to rent office space and requires special conditions because of certain equipment that must be installed. Such a situation permits elicitation of hard-to-get syntactic patterns, assessment of flexibility of vocabulary, and a detailed testing of comprehension.

Through all these interchanges the examiners are constantly alert to the examinee's scope and limitations in the language: The success he has in choosing precise words and structures or in making circumlocutions, the demands he makes on his listener in decoding the message transmitted, the degree to which he understands what he hears.

When they are satisfied with the speech sample collected, the speaking part ends, and they move to the assessment of reading ability, a relatively cut-and-dried procedure.

The reading part requires oral translation into English of passages of varying levels of difficulty, mainly unedited from newspapers, magazines, and non-fictional books. Topics are chosen from areas that are of interest to people in international affairs rather than to literary specialists.

The Rating System

The complete test yields two scores called respectively an S-Rating and an R-Rating, based on a scale from 0 (no practical proficiency) to 5 (native or bilingual proficiency). Each of the points from 1 to 5 on both S- and R- scales is defined in as much detail as universal applicability permits (see Appendix A), in both linguistic and functional terms. In addition every number except the 5 may be modified upward by a plus (e.g., S-2+), so that there is, effectively, an eleven point scale that can be used.

While the official definitions were developed in terms that could be useful to examiners, examinees, future employers, assignment boards, universities, etc., supplements to the S-Ratings were written later specifically for language specialists (Factors in Speaking Proficiency, Appendix B) and for examinees (Check List for Self-Appraisal, Appendix C). Although these three descriptions have different emphases, they converge in their characterization of behavior at each level.

Because the scales cover the whole range of competence, rather than mastery of a limited body of material as in an academic course, they are especially appropriate for measuring the varied patterns of growth demonstrated by the Peace Corps Volunteers. Here are two typical testing records for PCVs in Latin America:

Pre-training	Post-training	Mid-tour	Final
S-0	S-2	S-2+ R-2	S-3 R-3
S-2	S-3	S-3+ R-3+	S-4 R-4+

Even though this distance from one point to the next on the scale is not equal all along the range, the ratings can be handled statistically as if that were the case, without serious distortion. Consequently considerable information can be gained from analysis of test scores alone.

Linguistic Characteristics of PCVs

When the testing program first began there was much concern that the Volunteer would be penalized for the brand of the language he spoke. Peace Corps staff members assumed that Volunteers would be very proficient speakers of a highly localized illiterate "dialect." It was

suggested that a third rating be established to measure competence in this dialect--a suggestion which turned out to be unwarranted.

In every language tested the mistakes Volunteers make are normally those made by all native speakers of English. While most Volunteers acquire marked regional accents, this fact is of no importance so long as they are intelligible to an educated native speaker of the same region. Otherwise the range of vocabulary and ability to understand normal discourse is in no way exceptional. While fluency tends to be high, control of grammatical structure varies according to training, sensitivity to language, and amount of experience, not according to locale. Again and again two Volunteers working in the same village have come out with ratings as different as S-2 R-1+ and S-4 R-4. The first will deny that many forms of the language are used in the village (e.g., "But nobody ever used the subjunctive"); the other will have observed and mastered the usage of those very forms, will have read as widely as time and resources permit, and as a result will be more useful linguistically not only in that village but everywhere else the language is spoken.

It has become very clear in every group tested that growth in awareness of grammatical structure tends to stop at the end of training. Vocabulary expands and fluency increases, but it is very much the exceptional Volunteer who learns new morphological forms and syntactic patterns on his own. Most Volunteers simply do not hear features that were not pointed out (and, preferably, practiced) during training.

One of the consequences of this selective deafness is the inability of most Volunteers to compare themselves accurately on linguistic grounds with their fellows. It is not uncommon for some S-2+ to communicate more effectively than some S-3 for reasons that have nothing to do with language: warmth and attractiveness of personality imaginativeness in using gestures and props, and general skillfulness in exploiting face-to-face situations.

Getting along with the local citizenry and doing an effective job are not factors which can be taken into account by language specialists nor should they be. One of the continuing difficulties for examiners lies in convincing the Volunteer that it is reasonable and appropriate to judge his linguistic competence rather than his overall success in communication, and that the two abilities are not identical.

As training programs improve and Volunteers are given opportunity and encouragement to go on studying the language in the field, test scores should rise. The mid-tour tests are most valuable as diagnostic instruments which alert the Volunteer to the faults and gaps in his control of the language and provide data on weaknesses of training. If remedial work can be done before the terminal tests, both awareness and proficiency can be expected to improve.

APPENDIX A

LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY RATING SCALE

The rating scales described below have been adopted by the Peace Corps from the language rating scales developed by the Foreign Service Institute, Department of State to provide a meaningful method of characterizing the language skills of Peace Corps Trainees and Volunteers. Unlike academic grades, which measure achievement in mastering the content of a prescribed course, the S-rating for speaking proficiency and the R-rating for reading proficiency are based on the absolute criterion of the command of an educated native speaker of the language.

The definition of each proficiency level has been worded so as to be applicable to every language; obviously the amount of time and training required to reach a certain level will vary widely from language to language, as will the specific linguistic features. Nevertheless, a person with S-3s in both French and Chinese, for example, should have approximately equal linguistic competence in the two languages.

As currently used, all the ratings except the S-5 and R-5 may be modified by a plus (+), indicating that proficiency substantially exceeds the minimum requirements for the level involved but falls short of those for the next higher level.

DEFINITIONS OF ABSOLUTE RATINGS

ELEMENTARY PROFICIENCY (Speaking Proficiency)

S-1 Short definition: Able to satisfy routine travel needs and minimum courtesy requirements.

Amplification: Can ask and answer questions on topics very familiar to him; within the scope of his very limited language experience can understand simple questions and statements if they are repeated at a slower rate than normal speech; speaking vocabulary inadequate to express anything but the most elementary needs; errors in pronunciation and grammar are frequent, but can be understood by a native speaker used to

dealing with foreigners attempting to speak his language; while topics which are "very familiar" and elementary needs vary considerably from individual to individual, any person at the S-1 level should be able to order a simple meal, ask for a room in a hotel, ask and give street directions, tell time, handle travel requirements and basic courtesy requirements.

S-1+ Exceeds S-1 primarily in vocabulary, and is thus able to meet more complex travel and courtesy requirements. Normally his grammar is so weak that he cannot cope with social conversation; because he frequently says things he does not intend to say (e.g., he may regularly confuse person, number and tense in verbs). Pronunciation and comprehension are generally poor. Fluency may vary, but quite voluble speech cannot compensate for all the other serious weaknesses.

LIMITED WORKING PROFICIENCY

S-2 Short definition: Able to satisfy routine social demands and limited work requirements.

Amplification: Can handle with confidence but not with facility most social situations including introductions and casual conversations about current events, one's work, family, and autobiographical information, can handle with confidence but not with facility limited on-the-job requirements, e.g., simple instructions to students; simple explanations to co-workers; and descriptions of mechanical equipment; but may need help in handling any complications or difficulties in these situations. Can understand most conversations on non-technical subjects and has a speaking vocabulary sufficient to express himself simply with some circumlocutions (non-technical subjects being understood as topics which require no specialized knowledge); accent, though often quite American, is intelligible; can usually handle elementary constructions quite accurately but does not have thorough or confident control of the grammar.

S-2+ Exceeds S-2 primarily in fluency and in either grammar or vocabulary. Blatant deficiencies in one of these latter factors, or general weaknesses in both, usually prevent assignment of an S-3 rating. If a candidate is an S-3+ in vocabulary,

fluency, and comprehension, and if his grammatical errors do not interfere with understanding, he should be awarded an S-3, not an S-2+.

MINIMUM PROFESSIONAL PROFICIENCY

S-3 Short definition: Able to speak the language with sufficient structural accuracy and vocabulary to satisfy all normal social and work requirements and handle professional discussions within a special field.

Amplification: Can participate effectively in all general conversation; can discuss particular interests with reasonable ease; comprehension is quite complete for a normal rate of speech; vocabulary is broad enough that he rarely has to grope for a word; accent may be obviously foreign; control of grammar good; errors never interfere with understanding and rarely disturb the native speaker.

S-3+ Exceeds an S-3 primarily in vocabulary and in fluency or grammar. The kind of hesitancy which indicates uncertainty or effort in speech will normally prevent assignment of an S-4, though the candidate's way of speaking his native language should be checked in doubtful cases. Frequent grammatical errors must also limit the rating to an S-3+, no matter how excellent the pronunciation, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension.

FULL PROFESSIONAL PROFICIENCY

S-4 Short definition: Able to use the language fluently and accurately on all levels normally pertinent to professional needs.

Amplification: Can understand and participate in any conversation within the range of his experience with a high degree of fluency and precision of vocabulary, but would rarely be taken for a native speaker; errors of pronunciation and grammar quite rare; can handle informal interpreting from and into the language, but does not necessarily have the training or experience to handle formal interpreting.

S-4+ Should be considered as just short of an S-5. Examiners should always be prepared to justify the awarding of an S-4+ rather

than an S-5 by citing specific weaknesses. Reminder: Native-born and educated Americans can conceivably attain S-5. Performance in the test, not biographical information given, is what determines assignment of a rating.

NATIVE OR BILINGUAL PROFICIENCY

S-5 Short definition: Speaking proficiency equivalent to that of an educated native speaker.

Amplification: Has complete fluency in the language, practically equivalent to that of an educated native speaker. To attain this rating usually requires extensive residence in an area where the language is spoken, including having received part of his secondary or higher education in the language.

(Reading Proficiency)

ELEMENTARY PROFICIENCY

R-1 Short definition: Able to read elementary lesson material or common public signs.

Amplification: Can read material at the level of a second-semester college language course or a second-year secondary school course; alternately, able to recognize street sign office and shop designations, number, etc.

LIMITED WORKING PROFICIENCY

R-2 Short definition: Able to read intermediate lesson material or simple colloquial texts.

Amplification: Can read material at the level of a third-semester college language course or a third-year secondary school course; can read simple news items with extensive use of a dictionary.

MINIMUM PROFESSIONAL PROFICIENCY

R-3 Short definition: Able to read non-technical news items or technical writing in a special field.

Amplification: Can read technical writing in a special field or modern press directed to the general reader, i.e., news items or feature articles reporting on political, economic, military, and international events, or standard text material in the general field of the social sciences.

FULL PROFESSIONAL PROFICIENCY

R-4 Short definition: Able to read all styles and forms of the language pertinent to professional needs.

Amplification: Can read moderately difficult prose readily in any area of the social sciences directed to the general reader with a good education (through at least the secondary

school level), and difficult material in a special field including official and professional documents and correspondence; can read reasonably legible handwriting without difficulty.

NATIVE OR BILINGUAL PROFICIENCY

R-5 Short definition: Reading proficiency equivalent to that of an educated native speaker.

Amplification: Can read extremely difficult and abstract prose, as well as highly colloquial writings and the classic literary forms of the language; can draft good prose and make informal translations from English into the language.

FACTORS IN SPEAKING PROFICIENCY

	S-1	S-2	S-3	S-4	S-5
Pronunciation	Often unintelligible	Usually foreign but rarely unintelligible	Sometimes foreign but always intelligible		Native
Grammar	Accuracy limited to set expressions; almost no control of syntax often conveys wrong information	Fair control of most basic syntactic patterns; conveys meaning accurately in simple sentences most of time	Good control of most basic syntactic patterns; always conveys meaning accurately in reasonably complex sentences	Makes only occasional errors and these show no pattern of deficiency	Control equal to that of an educated native speaker
Vocabulary	Adequate only for survival, travel, and basic courtesy needs	Adequate for simple social conversation and routine job needs	Adequate for participation in all general conversation and for professional discussions in a special field	Professional and general vocabulary broad and precise, appropriate to occasion	Equal to vocabulary of an educated native speaker
Fluency	Except for memorized expressions, every utterance requires enormous obvious effort	Usually hesitant; often forced to silence by limitations of grammar and vocabulary	Rarely hesitant; always able to sustain conversation through circumlocutions	Speech on all professional matters as apparently effortless as in English; always easy to listen to	Speech at least as fluent and effortless as in English on all occasions

	S-1	S-2	S-3	S-4	S-5
Comprehension	May require much repetition, slow rate of speech; understands only very simple, short, familiar utterances	In general understands non-technical speech directed to him but sometimes misinterprets or needs utterances reworded. Usually cannot follow conversation between native speakers	Understands most of what is said to him; can follow speeches, clear radio broadcasts, and most conversation between native speakers, but not in great detail	Can understand all educated speech in any moderately clear context; occasionally baffled by colloquialisms and regionalisms	Equal to that of the native speaker

SELF-APPRAISAL LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY QUESTIONNAIRE

Appendix C

(All answers must be YES to achieve at least the level of proficiency listed on the left, except for four items at the S-3 level.)

		YES	NO
S-0+	Can you use a minimum of thirty words in appropriate contexts (i.e., not just count or recite days of the week)?	☐	☐
S-1	Can you tell someone how to get from here to the nearest hotel, restaurant, or post office?	☐	☐
	Can you ask and tell the time of day, day of the week, date?	☐	☐
	Can you order a simple meal?	☐	☐
	Can you negotiate for a hotel room or a taxi ride at a just price?	☐	☐
	Can you buy a needed item of clothing or a bus or train ticket?	☐	☐
	Can you understand and respond correctly to form questions about your nationality, marital status, occupation, date and place of birth, etc?	☐	☐
	Can you make a social introduction and use appropriate leave-taking expressions?	☐	☐
	Can you use the language well enough to assist someone who does not know the language in coping with the situation or problems covered by the S-1 range?	☐	☐
S-1+	Can you meet all S-1 requirements and at least three of the S-2 requirements listed below?	☐	☐
S-2	Can you describe your present or most recent job or activity in some detail?	☐	☐
	Can you give detailed information about your family, your house, the weather today?	☐	☐

S-2	Can you hire an employee, or arrange for special services (taking care of details such as salary, qualifications, hours, specific duties)?	☐	☐
	Can you give a brief autobiography and tell of immediate plans and hopes?	☐	☐
	Can you describe the geography of the United States or a familiar location?	☐	☐
	Can you describe the basic structure of the U.S. Government or of the U.S. educational system?	☐	☐
	Can you describe the purpose or function of the organization you represent?	☐	☐
	Do you feel confident that you understand what native speakers want to tell you on topics like those mentioned above and that they understand you (linguistically) at least 80% of the time?	☐	☐
	Can you use the language well enough to assist someone else who does not know the language in coping with the situations or problems covered by the S-2 range?	☐	☐
S-2+	Can you meet all S-2 requirements and at least three of these S-3 requirements?	☐	☐
S-3	(Answers should be NO) Are there any grammatical features of the language which you try to avoid?	☐	☐
	Do you sometimes find yourself in the middle of a sentence you cannot finish because of linguistic limitations (grammar or vocabulary)?	☐	☐
	Do you find it difficult to follow and contribute to a conversation among native speakers who try to include you in their talk?	☐	☐

S-3	Are you afraid that you will misunderstand information given to you over the telephone?	☐	☐
	(Answers should be YES) Can you speak to a group of educated native speakers on a professional subject and be sure you are communicating what you want to, without obviously amusing or irritating them linguistically?	☐	☐
	Can you listen, take notes, and summarize accurately a speech or an informal discussion on your area of special interests, heard on the radio or over a public address system?	☐	☐
	Can you (on a social occasion) defend U.S. attitudes toward culture, race relations, or foreign aid from attack by an anti-American student or politician?	☐	☐
	Can you cope with such trying linguistic situations as brokendown plumbing, an undeserved traffic ticket, a serious social or diplomatic blunder made by you or a colleague?	☐	☐
	Can you follow connected discourse on a non-technical subject, e.g., panel discussion on the status of women?	☐	☐
	Can you serve as an informal interpreter on subjects in the S-3 range?	☐	☐
	Do you feel that you have a professional command (rather than just a practical one) of the language?	☐	☐
S-3+	Can you meet all S-3 requirements and at least three of these S-4 requirements?	☐	☐
S-4	In professional discussions, is your vocabulary always extensive and precise enough to enable you to convey your exact meaning?	☐	☐

S-4	Are you able to alter your speech deliberately, depending upon whether you are talking to university professors, close friends, employees, etc.?	☐	☐
	Can you serve as an informal interpreter for a U.S. senator or cabinet official on all diplomatic and social functions?	☐	☐
	Do you practically never make a grammatical mistake?	☐	☐
	Do you think you can carry out any job assignment as effectively in the language as in English?	☐	☐
S-4+	In discussions on all subjects, is your vocabulary always extensive and precise enough to enable you to convey your exact meaning?	☐	☐
S-5	Do native speakers react to you as they do to each other?	☐	☐
	Do you sometimes feel more at home in the language than in English?	☐	☐
	Can you do mental arithmetic in the language without slowing down?	☐	☐
	Is your vocabulary at least as extensive and precise as in English?	☐	☐
	Do you consider yourself a native speaker of the language?	☐	☐

VI. IMPLEMENTATION AND REPORTING OF LANGUAGE TESTING

IMPLEMENTATION AND REPORTING OF LANGUAGE TESTING

The following procedure is requested by the Division of Language Training, Peace Corps/Washington for the implementation of Peace Corps Language Testing Policy:

1. The S-rating oral language proficiency system based on that used by the Foreign Service Institute and other agencies has been adopted by the Office of Language Training for evaluating language proficiency.

2. The language testing will be conducted by the language coordinators of the various projects, unless a special arrangement is made with competent testers in the Peace Corps or FSI.

3. All Peace Corps Trainees will be tested and given an S-rating:

a. Upon arrival at the training site, if he claims any proficiency in the target languages.

b. At mid-selection by an estimated S-rating based on classroom observation rather than formal testing.

c. At the end of training.

d. At the end of a significant period of field work.

4. These ratings will be reported on the Form "Oral Language Proficiency FSI Rating" for inclusion on Form PC- 233.

These reports are to be distributed as follows:

a. 1 copy to the Field Assessment Officer.
b. 1 copy to the Training Officer.
c. 1 copy to the Peace Corps Country Representative.
d. 1 copy to the Language Coordinator.
e. 1 copy for the Training Institution for inclusion in the Final Report.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING ORAL LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY FSI RATING REPORT

What is PC-1004?

The Oral Language Proficiency S-rating form is provided to the Language Coordinators on which they are to record data concerning Peace Corps trainees developed during the training program. The forms make possible systematic recording of information common to all training programs. This information is included in the Form PC-233, to be filed by the Field Assessment Officer (FAO). When correctly filled out by the FSO, the forms are punched and the cards sent to a computing center for statistical analysis. However, the Pc-1004 enables immediate transmittal of statistical information which can be sent to the computing center for analysis.

The attached forms should have a complete list of the names and questionnaire numbers of all Peace Corps trainees who reported for each project at your training site.

General Instructions

The forms need not be typewritten. They can be submitted in either pencil or ink, provided they are legible. Please take note of the following do's and don'ts in filling out the forms.

DO's	DON'Ts
Write one(1) digit in each cell.	Do not put more than one digit in each box.
Record all data in numerical form.	Do not letter code any data.
Record all data as whole numbers.	Do not record fractions or decimal points.
Record all data available on each trainee who reports to the training site.	Do not record plus or minus signs.
Include any available data on trainees who are selected out or resigned.	Do not write your numbers sideways
	Do not exclude any available data on trainees who are selected out or resigned.

46-51 Oral Language Proficiency (FSI S-Rating): Scores should be recorded in columns 46-47 for the FSI test given at the start of training, in columns 48-49 for the test given at the end of training and if a test is given after field training, scores should be recorded in columns 50-51. All scores should be recorded as 2 digit numbers according to the following table:

FSI Rating	Columns 46-47 48-49 50-51
S5	5 0
S4+	4 5
S4	4 0
S3+	3 5
S3	3 0
S2+	2 5
S2	2 0
S1+	1 5
S1	1 0
S0+	0 5

52 Please leave blank...

53-55 Language Code: Fill in the language code as indicated on the attached list. If all trainees take the same language, record the code in the top row on each sheet and draw an arrow down.

56-58 Number of Hours of Language Taught: Record the ACTUAL number of hours of the first language taught. Do not include language tables and other extra-curricular activities.

59-60 If a second language is given, to some or all of the trainees, record the final FSI score in these two spaces.

61-63 Record the second language code as in 53-55.

| Country & Project Type | | | | FSI LANGUAGE TESTING | | | |

LANGUAGE CODES

Afghan (See Persian)		Hausa	058
Akan (Twi)	022	Hiligaynon	171
Akposso	211	Hindi	060
Amharic	004	Igbo	063
Arabic, Eastern	005	Ila-tonga	166
Arabic, Western	006	Ilocano	064
Aymara	012	Idonesian	065
Bakweri	181	Javanese	069
Bambara-Malinke	014	Kabre	190
Bamenda	182	Kannada	070
Bamikeke	180	Kanouri	188
Bassa-Cameroons	016	Kapingamarangi	214
Baoule	117	Kashmiri	071
Bengali	020	Kikongo	073
Berber	021	Kikuyu	074
Bini	164	Kimbundu	075
Bulu	023	Kinyarwanda	076
Burmese	024	Kissi	187
Cebuano	155	Kituba (Monokutuba)	078
Chamorrow	203	Korean	079
Chinese (Cantonese)	028	Kotokoli	191
Chinese (Mandarin)	030	Kpelle	186
Chinyanja (Nyanja)	107	Krio	080
Chokwe	034	Kru	184
Creole (See Haitian or Martinique)		Kumba	183
Djerma (Songhai)	161	Kurdish	081
Doula	037	Kusaie	207
Efik	189	Lamba	082
English	999	Lingala	085
Ewe	040	Lome	185
Ewondo	041	Lunda	089
Fanagalo	042	Luba	087
Fang	165	Luganda	088
Farsi (Persian) (See Persian)		Luo	090
Farsi (Afghan) See Persian, Afghan)		Malagasy	092
Fon	046	Malay	093
French	047	Malayalam	094
Fula	048	Malink (See Bambara-Malinke)	
Ga	049	Marathi	096
Galla	051	Marshallese	205
Greek	054	Martinque Creole	097
Guarani	055	Masai	098
Gujarati	056	Maya	099
Haitian Creole	057	Mende	100

Monokutuba (See Kituba)
More 102
Mortlokese 212
Mpongwe 177
Nepali 103
Nubian 105
Nyamwezi-Sukuma 106
Nyanja (See Chinyanja)
Oriya 109
Palavan 206
Papiamento 111
Pashto 112
Persian 113
Persian Afghan 114
Pidgin 172
Pizar-Malay 173
Ponapean 204
Portuguese 116
Pulap 110
Punjabi 210
Quechua 117
Rundi 119
Sango 121
Sara 122
Senari 192
Serer 124
Shona 125
Sindebele 126
Sindhi 127
Singhalese 128
Somali 131
Songhai (Formerly Zarma, See Djerma)
Soninke 132
Sotho 133
Spanish 134
Sukuma (See Nyamwezi)
Susu 135
Suthu 167
Swahili 136
Swati 168
Tagalog 138
Tamil 139
Telegu 140
Temne 141
Thai 142
Tigre 143
Tigrinya 144
Trukese (Lagoon Dialect) 215
Tshwa 145
Tsonga 146
Tswana 147
Tumbuka 174
Turkish 148
Twi (See Akan)
Ulithi 209
Umbundu 150
Urdu 151
Vai 153
Visayan (See Cebuano)
Weskos 175
Woleai 213
Wolof 158
Yakut 159
Yapese 208
Yiddish 176
Yoruba 160
Zarma-Songhai (See Djerma)
Zulu 162
Zula-Xhosa 163

VII. CRITICAL QUESTIONS FOR PLANNING AND EVALUATING THE LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAM

CRITICAL QUESTIONS FOR PLANNING AND EVALUATING THE LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAM

I. Selection of Instructor

1. Is the candidate for instructor interested in and willing to work with a method of intensive oral repetition and drill?

2. Does the candidate show insight into the psychological aspects of language learning and interest and ability to deal with possible personality difficulties?

3. Is the candidate aware of and willing to adapt to the demands of the program, such as unusual living conditions, unforseen program changes, participation in other components, etc.?

4. Does the candidate have a positive attitude toward the job, the United States, the Peace Corps, and the American?

II. Training of Instructor

1. Is the instructor thoroughly trained in the accepted method of instruction?

2. Does he believe in the efficacy of the method?

3. Is the instructor properly supervised by a language specialist? If not, is there someone who can see that the instructor is handling the instruction with methodological skill and insight in the psychological aspects and problems of language learning and teaching?

III. Materials

1. Are the basic training materials designed for an oral approach to teach the spoken language?

2. Are efforts being made to produce language materials tailored to the specific training program? (Number of hours available, in-country training, etc.)

3. Are the language materials appropriate to the target culture, the job and the role of the PCV?

IV. The Language Coordinator

1. Does the Language Coordinator use modern oral methods of language teaching?

2. Does the Language Coordinator regularly visit the classes to provide linguistic support and control for the students and supervision of teachers?

3. Is the Language Coordinator providing in-service teacher training when necessary during the program?

4. Does the Language Coordinator stimulate environmental support for the language program; does he develop imaginative "Cultural Immersion" activities to stimulate extra-curricular use of the language?

5. Does the Language Coordinator receive cooperation and support from the other staff members, particularly from the Project Director?

6. Does the Language Coordinator show appreciation of the importance of attitude and motivation; does he engender enthusiasm by his approach and his own interest?

7. Is the Language Coordinator providing training or guidance for continuing language study in the field?

V. Class Structure

1. Are classes no larger than 6 trainees?

2. Are classes as homogeneous as possible, that is, similar language aptitude, similar prior levels of competence in the contact language, learning rates, educational and age levels, etc.?

3. Are classes regularly reorganized to reflect the changing levels of the trainees?

4. Do trainees and teacher get along well together, enjoy each other's company?

5. Do the trainees arrive promptly to class?

6. Is individual attention being given to trainees having special difficulties?

VI. Environmental Support

1. Is the Volunteer encouraged to use the language outside of class?

2. Does the Volunteer have a realistic reason to speak the language out of class?

3. Do the instructors speak the target language outside of class rather than English?

4. Are there language tables, newspapers, magazines, movies, realia, etc. to stimulate use of the language outside of class?

5. Are there social activities, informal hours which encourage or involve the target language?

VII. Attitude of Instructor

1. Does he enjoy his work?

2. Do the trainees like him personally?

3. Does he have a warm, pleasant classroom manner?

4. Is he enthusiastic about his work, the language, his trainees?

5. Does he willingly accept the training materials, method, and suggestions from the Language Coordinator?

6. Does he speak his language at all times or does he use English, especially out of class?

VIII. Attitude of Trainee

1. Does he enjoy his study?

2. Does he believe in and accept the language teaching method?

3. Does he express his interest in the contact language? Does he want to speak the language?

4. Does he constantly look for opportunities to speak the contact language in and out of class?

IX. Relation of the Language Training Program to Total Training Program

1. Is there a regularly scheduled language program--an established routine?

2. Do classes meet regularly or are they interrupted for other activities?

3. Is the training program allotting sufficient class hours for language training and for preparation outside of class? Is the number of class contact hours sufficient to meet the requirements of the program?

4. Is there consistency in the type of materials and methodology among the different instructors?

5. Is the language training program coordinated with other training activities?

X. Goals of Language Training Program

1. Have the objectives and expectations of the language training program been clearly presented and defined to the training staff, as well as to the trainees?

2. Are the goals realistic?

3. Is the language training program achieving the stated expectations?

4. Is the language training program geared to the individual capacities of the Volunteers?